



Richland County Council  
Coronavirus AD Hoc Committee Meeting  
**MINUTES**  
April 5, 2023 – 2:00 PM  
Council Chambers  
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Gretchen Barron, Chair; Jason Branham, and Chakisse Newton.

OTHERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Allison Terracio, Sarah Harris, Chelsea Bennett, Dante Roberts, Michelle Onley, Ashiya Myers, Stacey Hamm, Dale Welch, Lori Thomas, Leonardo Brown, Angela Weathersby, Anette Kyrlo, Kyle Holsclaw, Nadia Rutherford, and Susan O'Cain.

**CALL TO ORDER** – Chairwoman Gretchen Barron called the meeting to order at approximately 2:03 PM.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. **February 14, 2023** – Mr. Branham moved to approve the minutes as distributed, seconded by Ms. Newton  
In Favor: Branham, Barron, and Newton  
The vote in favor was unanimous.

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. Newton moved to adopt the agenda as published, seconded by Mr. Branham.

In Favor: Branham, Barron, and Newton  
The vote in favor was unanimous.

**ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/ACTION**

- a. **American Rescue Plan Application Request, Review, and Recommendation**

Ms. Barron noted Councilmembers had an opportunity to review the applicants and applications in detail. The goal today is to take each category up separately. She understands there is a list and many things to address. She indicated she was okay with forwarding one or two committee recommendations to Council and reconvening the committee to continue the work. She would like to move something out of committee today, but moreover, she wants to be a good steward of the funds the Federal government has provided us. She noted it had been a big task, and the Richland County citizens have been awaiting these much-needed dollars.

Mr. Leonardo Brown, County Administrator, stated we are at the stage where it is in the committee's hands to utilize the information provided through the third-party process. What is before the committee is the applications and the information that was vetted. The request is for the committee to consider which programs to fund.

- **BROADBAND** – Ms. Barron stated the State had provided an exorbitant amount of money to go into broadband. At this point, we need to determine if we are providing duplicate funds for the same services.

Ms. Newton noted since we accepted these applications, there has been a significant amount of investment in broadband, and those dollars are continuing to roll in. Among those dollars is a household-by-household credit for internet services, which will be available to everyone. She spoke with the State Director of Broadband to determine where we could make the most significant impact. A recommendation was to look at organizations that are community anchors (i.e., libraries and schools), those organizations would serve a broader geographic area across the County. Based on that, she would recommend the Richland Library Program, which gives us geographic diversity across the County. It has a track record of lending things to people. She would also look at Columbia International University. It serves a smaller geographic area but falls into the community anchor category.

Mr. Branham stated library programs were likely strong candidates for funds in this category. He noted he was looking at the Recreation Commission's program and there seem to be quality objectives, the program appears to be new.

Mr. Livingston stated the State and Federal funding seemed to be more toward broadband infrastructure. He noted he believes we need to look at those geared more toward services instead of infrastructure.

Ms. Barron stated she would like to see additional hot spots. At a glance, many of the applicants we have recommended have already received some funds. At this point, she is leery of supplanting. She suggests that we look closely at a couple of the organizations. She wants staff to know that when we do the desk review, all unallowable costs are backed out so that people understand that even if they see \$800,000 does not mean they will get that amount.

Ms. Newton requested an explanation of how the desk review will work.

Assistant County Administrator, Lori Thomas, stated the third-party vendor would sit down with the applicant to understand further their budget and the actual use of funds to determine which funds are applicable and which may be questionable.

Ms. Newton inquired if the desk review would occur before the committee recommendation is forwarded to Council. She feels there is additional information that would be helpful for the whole body, but she does not want us to violate any best practices or be unnecessarily duplicative.

Ms. Sarah Harris, Grants Director, stated that we would have a good idea of which applicants would be awarded. We would take the information and look in the background to obtain the additional preliminary information needed. If you are going through your review and have questions, we could provide them to the applicants to vet some of those processes.

Ms. Newton noted that the desk review could be done either way.

Mr. Brown stated if the committee is going to vet the potential recipients and then forward them to Council, what would happen if Council's view is different? He wants to make sure how we allow the committee to make their recommendations does not step on the toes of Council.

Ms. Newton indicated the more she looked, the more questions she had. She was thinking if we take our recommendations to Council, will it pause there?

Ms. Barron stated she thinks it is to our advantage to decide on what we are recommending. If there are some details in the budget of the organizations that give us heartburn, make those recommendations in committee, and then equip staff with our full recommendation for them to do their desk review and bring back the information as a part of our recommendation to full Council.

Ms. Newton moved to forward to Council a recommendation to approve funding for Columbia International University and Richland Library, seconded by Ms. Barron.

In Favor: Branham, Barron, and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- **AFFORDABLE HOUSING** – Ms. Barron stated there was some conversation about the expectations of the committee and Council and what we received. She noted that with these housing projects, we are looking at applicants requesting funds to purchase land and build within the timeframe. Now that she has set with the applications, there is a concern that any of the projects can get off the ground, implemented, and have all the steps completed within our time period. We had applicants marked at a higher risk for the County because their projects would not be completed within the time period. When we look at the applications we have set forth and the ones that may have been eliminated, she thinks they are all in the same category. She wants us to be able to support affordable housing, but when we look at this pot of money, we do have constraints on how we need to move forward when we are awarding these dollars. She does not want us to award dollars that we know will not be able to meet the deadline.

Mr. Branham stated the consultant expressed there were additional restrictions related to the spending of these funds to purchase property.

Ms. Thomas indicated there is a concern with acquiring property and transferring that property to another individual. You go from sub-recipient to beneficiary, and

who determines the beneficiary? With these funds, there would be quite a few guidelines the Federal government would impose on those. As Ms. Barron pointed out, some of the other applications did not meet the risk threshold because we would be at risk of not completing the projects and potentially putting the loss of funds at risk.

Mr. Branham stated from what he sees in the notes on the grants, none of them risk the acquisition of property as part of the proposal.

Ms. Thomas responded in the affirmative. These applicants proposed some sort of service. The concern from the work session was that it was not adding additional units.

Ms. Newton stated she wants to ensure we adhere carefully to the Federal guidelines and only do things for which we will be reimbursed. Her desire and thoughts, when we approve these dollars, is that we would increase the number of units. She noted \$4M would not increase the

number tremendously because that amount does not get you what it used to. There was a time when Mr. Brown mentioned there might be alternate structures we could look at to achieve the goal. For example, do we say we will allocate funds from the General Fund in this amount where we have greater control and can influence affordable housing units and do something with the guidelines with the ARPA dollars? For her, that is what she would like to explore. She does not know that it has been thought through enough where we can direct the Administrator to go forth, but where there is a motion to request a proposal on how to achieve that. The applicants we have before us are worthy of funding, but she would not recommend funding any of these projects but investigating some alternate way to put the same number of dollars into increasing the number of units. She also noted that Richland County has already expended millions of dollars for some of these services (i.e., rental assistance) but has not addressed increasing the number of units.

Mr. Livingston noted what he had hoped when we started talking about affordable housing: we could use these funds to develop a housing trust fund and to be able to leverage these funds with private funds and grants. If there is any creative way we can realize these funds and this process to engage and start a housing trust fund, it would be great.

Ms. Barron indicated the goal was increasing the number of houses or the workforce market. A lot of it has come through community advocates like More Justice. Council finds this important, which is why we allotted the \$4M. For us to be true to the process, or intent, she would like us to devise creative ways to do what we set out to do, whether Council desires to create a housing trust or help to fund one. This is the largest pot of money Council set aside. This was our biggest investment, and we have to get it right.

Mr. Brown stated that if the committee desires to do that, they should articulate that so it can be captured as a part of their motion. Whoever makes the motion should direct the Administrator to provide a mechanism or process allowing \$4M allocated through ARPA funds to be dollar-for-dollar exchanged, where possible, with General Fund dollars to an affordable housing trust fund. The idea is that whatever funds you want to utilize to pursue the affordable housing trust fund potentially would be exchanged for General Fund dollars. We would utilize the ARPA funds in other areas and allow you the flexibility to do what you want to do to add affordable housing units. He wants to ensure you do not think it would be these dollars plus General Fund dollars because that is not something we could sustain.

Mr. Branham inquired if we could identify funds that had been appropriated for something that would qualify for ARPA funds and be able to switch that out in a targeted way so the \$4M is not floating there open-ended, but that it has to be spent within an ARPA timeframe, and on an ARPA qualifying purpose.

Mr. Brown stated we have a portion of the ARP dollars that are considered to fall under the loss revenue column. The loss revenue column allows for those that are under the umbrella but they do not have a specified use. We want to ensure the funds we use in the loss revenue column are applicable projects. The loss revenue column is general and allows for more flexibility for the County so that we have more access to do that, but the sources will be items the County has identified as priorities. We do not want to tailor it too narrowly, so you reduce the ability to meet the threshold for the \$4M.

Mr. Branham stated he fully supports maximizing the value of the \$4M to expand available, affordable housing units. He wanted to ensure we were not consequently expanding the budget.

Mr. Brown noted we would not be creating any additional uses that have not already been considered in the recommended budget for the purpose of the General Fund and ARPA dollars exchange.

Ms. Terracio stated she is not sure she would want to limit the motion to just the trust fund but rather be able to explore the mechanisms that would best serve the County.

Ms. Newton indicated there had been a lot of confusion about the way trust funds work, and that may not be the vehicle that achieves the goal. There may be applications that were not considered because they were deemed riskier because of the land acquisition process. She does not think we should rule out the applications that were vetted but a slight altering of the rubric.

Mr. Brown noted if there is a motion that allows for the exchange so that General Fund dollars become the dollars that are used, and you talk about the myriad options, you want to consider, you then would come back to address those applications.

Ms. Barron stated we need to be clear in the motion what our options are. If that is to explore housing trust or prioritize those applications we already have on file, that is where we need to start. She noted our being vague during this process has now come back to us. She does not want this to come back to us, but be specific in what we ask for.

Mr. Branham noted it appeared when the Greenville Housing Fund's application was submitted the fund did not yet own the 200-unit affordable housing complex. The application was submitted with the contemplation of acquiring it and replacing the roof. He indicated it sounded like it would be new affordable housing units.

Ms. Thomas responded the units already existed.

Mr. Branham inquired if the Greenville Housing Fund currently owns them.

Ms. Thomas replied she did not know, which was the contemplation.

For clarification, Mr. Branham stated that the units already exist as affordable housing.

Ms. Thomas responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Terracio stated she hoped that this body could allocate funds to improve the living conditions for those individuals residing in these units. In essence, we would create new units and improve the living conditions of existing affordable housing units.

For clarification, Ms. Barron stated Ms. Terracio supports additional affordable housing and repairs.

Ms. Terracio replied in the affirmative. She indicated her understanding is that we are not just creating new units but also making units livable. She also would not like to exclude the option of working with entities that have come before us, perhaps just not in this particular way.

Ms. Barron stated she believes this category intended to create additional housing, which is where the challenge comes in with the existing list. If the body would like to include that in the motion, then most definitely.

Mr. Livingston noted he is concerned that if we focus on repairing units, we will not get any new ones. He suggested splitting the funding for new and vacated units, so we will know it is an available unit that is not presently being used.

Ms. Newton stated that the goal for her is new units, not repairing or alleviating existing ones. She advocates for stronger regulations so that can happen through the appropriate channels.

Mr. Brown indicated the language staff is providing will allow us to comply with the American Rescue Plan Act dollars use and also address what the committee is asking to potentially do to utilize dollars to address the specific need under affordable housing.

Ms. Thomas stated the intent here is for Council to invest \$4M in affordable housing. Perhaps the motion could be to direct the Administrator to propose a plan to invest \$4M in affordable housing...in new units, etc. Staff could then bring forward a plan showing the funding mechanisms.

Ms. Barron moved to direct the Administrator to propose a plan to invest \$4M into affordable housing by adding new and/or vacated units.

Ms. Newton inquired about what a vacated unit is.

Mr. Livingston noted we have abandoned apartment units that could be made available for individuals who do not have a home.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, if no one is using it and then it becomes an affordable housing unit, it would be a new affordable housing unit without the need to specify that it was vacated.

Mr. Livingston stated that some people may not say it is a new unit.

For clarification, Ms. Terracio noted we are not just limiting the new units to new construction.

Ms. Newton moved to direct the Administrator to propose a plan to invest \$4M in affordable housing, specifically to add new affordable housing units to the market, seconded by Mr. Branham.

In Favor: Branham, Barron, and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- YOUTH AND RECREATIONAL SERVICES – Ms. Barron stated it was a stretch for her on one or two of the applications and whether they are in the correct category. She noted there is a lot of personnel included in it. It concerns her whether the listed personnel will be 100% for the projects or if we are funding additional personnel doing other tasks. As she mentioned in the work session, the intent was not to create new positions that will go away when the funding goes away, negatively impacting the community.

Ms. Newton stated that similar to affordable housing, where the proposals that were ranked the highest did not correspond to the vision for the service, youth and recreation services falls here. She advocated and increased the funds to \$1M because the youth in the community needs so much right now. We were going to provide services and recreation to young people to help them get off the streets. There are some proposals where the closest they get to youth is that they were young at some point, which is not what we are trying to do. She does not feel good about allocating the funds here and it does not fill the intent of what she was recommending. She would be willing to discuss the proposal from the Midlands Mediation Center because that proposal is about training an army of volunteers who can go out into the community and teach people conflict resolution skills. She has experience helping to support narrative mediation training for youth, and she was able to see how they interacted with people differently. Some of these people's long-standing conflicts were resolved on the spot. Even though this is not what she had in mind, she would like to discuss this proposal because our people need to know how to handle conflict better. Regarding the other grant proposals, she is not in a position to support them because she does not feel like it does the intent of what she advocated for.

Mr. Branham stated that the spirit of the Able SC application is wonderful, but at the same time, so much of the funds are proposed for salaries for new positions.

Ms. Newton acknowledged these are excellent organizations, and her comments in no way imply the work they are proposing is not noble work or organizations but does not meet the intent or spirit of which she was advocating for funds.

Ms. Barron noted she is a big fan of the Big Red Barn. The work they are doing for first responders and veterans is amazing. Her concern is that this category is for youth and recreation, and she does not think this application is in the proper location. She indicated she could support the Healthy Learners, although their application is salary heavy. Therefore, she cannot support their application as submitted. If an organization is not in the proper location, she would like us to entertain moving the entity to a more appropriate area. For the record, she can support Healthy Learners, Able SC, and Midlands Mediation Center.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we could use these funds for a comprehensive summer job program which he knows the youth will benefit from.

Ms. Barron noted she believes that was the intent. We were talking about parks, activities, and things for the youth to do. What this body has to determine is if there is money left over after we allocate the funds, what do we do with the residual funds? It could be that we have another look at the applications on file or have a blank motion that says all leftover funding goes to a particular place.

Mr. Brown indicated, in some instances, applicants did not put down a particular category. If there was someone you wanted to look at funding and send to the desk review process, you certainly could do that. In addition, many people may have applied under non-profit, and the third-party review determined it was an ineligible use, so they attempted to find the next best place for the application to go so it would not get lost.

Ms. Newton stated Mr. Brown's statement concerns her a lot. She would like clarity on whether the categories we are looking at represent categories selected by applicants or a third party. She noted we are here evaluating specific buckets, so to say we are going to move funding from this bucket to the other bucket may mean that a bucket where there is enough funding for everybody now becomes a bucket where there is not enough funding or alter previous recommendations. She was operating under the assumption that people put themselves in this category. If they put themselves in that category, then it is one thing to say we asked for "apples," and you are a "cumquat."

Mr. Brown stated early on we discussed that one of the reasons why it took so long for the reviews is because, in some incidences, people did not select a category.

Ms. Newton stated, at least with the organizations that have been put forward, to understand if they put themselves in the category. For her, that affects how she moves forward. Secondly, she will be prepared, at the appropriate time, to make a motion for what to do with categories where we do not expend all the funds. Because of how far we are off the mark with youth and recreation services, she would like to put it aside. For the other categories, she would like to apply any unallocated funds to the DSS facility.

Ms. Newton moved to forward a recommendation to Council to fund the Midlands Mediation Center and reserve the remaining funds in the Youth and Recreation Services category to be allocated at a later date as consistent with the Federal ARPA guidelines.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Branham stated he sees violence prevention, crime reduction, and community relations specifically targeting young people as valid, but so much of the funding relates to salaries. He understands that people's time is the essence of the project, but he understood a small amount would go toward rental spaces for listening and mediation sessions. He would like to support it but cannot at this level.

Ms. Barron reminded the committee there is still the desk review. Based on her expertise in grants, many of them will not receive full funding.

Ms. Newton noted that if you are training volunteers, someone has to train them, which is how she looked at it. The way we have been approaching this is to make a motion to approve something and send it to Council. She inquired if there was an opportunity, since we have more questions about a particular application, to have someone talk with the applicant and get more information.

Mr. Brown stated to the extent that you were considering their application for potential funding, getting clarity from them that only they can provide would be reasonable.

Ms. Newton inquired if it would be most appropriate to table this and gave more directive questions to Administration so they could be specifically asked.

Ms. Barron indicated we could direct staff to ask whatever questions we have and bring it back to the committee before we make a recommendation.

Ms. Newton noted she does not know if she has enough questions about other groups to slow down the process.

Mr. Branham stated he was content with tabling this item. We have shared some prevailing concerns that have commonality across applications. With a little time, we may be able to provide additional guidance or set a policy that relates to salaries.

Ms. Barron stated if we are going to move forward, we need to be specific about what we are requesting staff to do.

Ms. Newton inquired if we are talking about all categories.

Ms. Barron responded she was specifically referring to the Youth and Recreation Services category.

Ms. Newton suggested sending specific questions to staff by the end of the week.

- SENIOR ASSISTANCE – Ms. Barron stated the only comment she has regarding this category is that it is slightly over our amount.

Ms. Newton noted she might need to take a slightly different look at how the expenditures shake out as we look at some of the staffing concerns. She noted they seemed like worthy projects and was inclined to consider splitting the funding. As it related to SC UpLift, she was curious about their approach to geographic diversity. She thinks there are people across the county that need assistance. Some people are harder to reach than others. To invest this level of funding, she would like to understand how they will approach hitting people in all parts of the county.

Ms. Barron stated she must recuse herself from this category because she works with the SC Community Action Partnership.

- NON-PROFITS – Ms. Barron noted the Community Relations Council, the Lourie Center, and Palmetto AIDS Life Support Services have already received ARPA funds. We are specifically looking at premium pay for Cooperative Ministries, Columbia City Ballet, Epworth Children's Home, and Midlands Mediation Center. She noted several applications were heavy in salaries. Her biggest concern with this category is the applications requesting funds for employee salaries. She does not believe that the intent of this body is to pay 100% of salaries for employees, and she would not support paying salaries out of these funds.

Ms. Newton indicated one of the areas she was curious about is that one of the applications is specifically for pandemic premium pay. She inquired if this was one that Ms. Barron would look less favorably on.

Ms. Barron replied she believes this application is different. She noted Council has already set forth premium pay for County staff. When speaking of salaries, she is talking about us paying the entire salary, and it is not COVID-related.

Ms. Newton stated this is a category where we said you are a non-profit would you like help that meets the ARPA guidelines. She inquired as to how many organizations applied for the non-profit category.

Ms. Thomas will provide that information at a later date.

Ms. Newton stated she felt comfortable with the good work the Cooperative Ministry and Epworth Children's Home have been doing. She indicated she could support parts of the Midlands Mediation Center but would be curious about some of the assertions made in their application. She noted she struggled with the Columbia City Ballet's application.

Mr. Livingston stated he was concerned about the amount for marketing. He indicated he was okay with the Midlands Mediation Center application.

Ms. Barron noted she had some challenges with the ballet and the amount of funding they requested. She knows COVID negatively impacted the ballet, but she is not sure it is 100% our responsibility to supplement or fulfill the salary request. She stated she supported the other entities' requests.

Ms. Newton mentioned so much was in the ballet's application, and she had questions and concerns in many places. She did not feel she could back out a number for even partial funding.

Ms. Barron suggested directing staff to have a conversation with the Columbia City Ballet before making a recommendation to Council.

Ms. Newton inquired if Ms. Barron is suggesting to keep this item in committee and send along questions or to send recommendations to Council and provide additional questions.

Ms. Barron responded to send recommendations to Council and provide additional questions.

Ms. Newton moved to forward to Council a recommendation to fund the Cooperative Ministry, Epworth Children's Home, and Midlands Mediation Center. In addition, any questions the committee has regarding the Columbia City Ballet be sent to staff for them to provide answers. Ms. Barron seconded the motion.

In Favor: Barron and Newton

Not Present: Branham

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- FOOD INSECURITY – Ms. Barron mentioned that Senior Resources has already received \$548,046 in funding, which leaves us with \$1.4M. She noted this particular category was one of those that it appeared there could be supplanting. It appeared the funds may not be used for

new projects or expansion of existing projects but to replace existing funds. If we fund these organizations, and that is the case, it exposes the County to liability.

Ms. Newton inquired if the application in the packet from Senior Resources is in addition to all the other funding or are we subtracting.

Mr. Brown responded this particular request is an additional ask. If you look on the "Food Insecurity Grants" page, the \$548,046 was approved during the previous budget process. This particular request has not been approved.

For clarification, Ms. Newton stated Senior Resources would be requesting the \$500,000 plus the \$800,000.

Mr. Brown replied the \$548,046 would have already been received, so technically, they are not asking again.

Ms. Newton clarified that Senior Resources is making an additional request for \$800,000, separate and apart from the previous allocation.

Ms. Barron stated that, to that point, it is an additional ask for the same program.

Ms. Thomas noted the funds allocated during the budget process in June 2022 were for the fiscal year July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023. If you look in the application, they are requesting to fund July 1, 2023, through December 31, 2024.

Ms. Newton inquired if Ms. Thomas had any information about any other applications Senior Resources has made or plans to make as we enter the new budget cycle.

Ms. Thomas does not recall if they have received a request from them. Additionally, if they were to apply for Community Impact funding, that application process has yet to begin.

Ms. Newton inquired if the Community Impact Grants would be the most appropriate vehicle that Senior Resources might use to apply for additional funding.

Ms. Thomas responded that would be her understanding.

Ms. Newton stated it was her understanding, at the last Community Impact Grants meeting, there was a motion made that some organizations would be granted line item status in the budget. She inquired if that was a correct representation.

Mr. Brown indicated the wording used was that they would not have to go through a competitive proceeding to receive funds the County allocates.

Ms. Newton remarked it was her understanding that 9-10 organizations where they would not have to go through the competitive funding process and that Senior Resources was one of those organizations.

Mr. Brown responded that the Clerk's Office signified that is correct.

Ms. Newton noted as we look at the requests made for this category, there were more requests than we could fund. If we wanted to support everyone at their requested level, an additional \$487,000 would be needed. She mentioned because this is a budget item, she expressed concerns that they are requesting funds from this bucket and potentially receiving funds from another grant source. Also, she echoed Ms. Barron's concerns about us supplanting instead of being additive. The intent was to expand the reach. For example, she noted she worked with a group of non-profits that received funding from a grant organization, and their motto was "but for Acme." When they funded people, it was because the non-profit could not have reached the additional height "but for Acme." She indicated that is what she wants to see, not the County paying for something the entity is already doing.

Mr. Livingston stated there is no direct funding for the agencies the Community Impact Grant Committee recommended.

With respect to the Community Impact Grants, Ms. Barron stated these are "Friends of Richland County." As these are "Friends of Richland County," they are now in this group that does not have to go through the competitive process when going through the budget cycle. The budget cycle will determine if they receive \$2 or \$5. It is her understanding the committee could make a recommendation or specific Councilmembers can make motions, as in the past. She noted given the hour; she would request putting a "pin" in the discussion. If there are any questions regarding these categories, forward those questions to Ms. Thomas by next Wednesday, April 12<sup>th</sup>. During this time, we request Ms. Thomas contact the entities and pose Councilmembers' questions.

Ms. Newton inquired if it was possible and appropriate for the organizations we recommend to be forwarded to Council to submit a short abstract summarizing their project. She noted some of the organizations did a better job than others in explaining their project.

Ms. Barron indicated that Ms. McBride and another Councilmember had similar concerns and mentioned an abstract.

Ms. Harris replied this is a part of the pre-eligibility process, so nothing has been set in stone, so we can certainly reach out and request an abstract.

Ms. Newton expanded her request for an abstract to any project still under consideration.

Ms. Barron inquired when Ms. Newton would like to receive the abstracts. She mentioned this could be confusing if we send some recommendations through with abstracts and could also further delay the process. If we request the Grants Team to request this pre-eligibility document, we also need to be specific about when we want it back and what process we want it to be linked to.

Ms. Newton stated her intent is not to slow down the process and is open to suggestions about the timeframe. In terms of the organizations she is including, she is including all organizations currently under consideration by Council. She would be willing to exclude those organizations in categories where we have already made recommendations. Regarding the timeline, she will rely on the Grants Office to make a reasonable suggestion.

Mr. Brown indicated they could make the request, but they are depending on the organizations to respond. What is reasonable to us may not fit their schedules.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we have an anticipated timeframe.

Ms. Barron responded we do not have an established timeframe, but she made a note to do so.

Mr. Livingston noted this process has been overwhelming. In hindsight, it might have been helpful if we had taken up a couple of categories at a time.

Ms. Barron responded that was the goal today, but that could have been communicated before the meeting.

Ms. Newton inquired, based on where we are in the schedule, when would the recommendations made at today's meeting be on a Council agenda.

Ms. Anette Kirylo, Clerk to Council, responded the motions will go to the April 18<sup>th</sup> Council meeting.

Ms. Harris stated the Grants Office will do what it can to get the answers back as soon as possible.

Ms. Newton suggested prioritizing the organizations we will discuss at the next committee meeting. In terms of a method, we have often received supplemental documentation by email. The organizations being recommended for funding on April 18<sup>th</sup> may be inclined to return their information in a timely manner.

Ms. Barron noted that when we communicate with the organizations, we are specific in our requests and let them know they cannot move forward without the requested information. She inquired if requesting this information would require a motion by this body.

Mr. Wright responded he did not believe so. You are requesting specific information; therefore, Administration could do that.

Ms. Barron stated that moving forward, we will request additional information from a couple of groups. In addition, at a later date, we will request those entities included in the binder to submit an abstract. If there are any questions regarding a specific applicant, forward your questions to Ms. Thomas by April 12<sup>th</sup>. She mentioned that she would be creating a timeline so that we can continue this process.

**ADJOURNMENT** – Ms. Newton moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Barron.

In Favor: Barron and Newton

Not Present: Branham

The vote in favor was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:03 PM.